



**Bicycle/Pedestrian  
Advisory  
Committee  
of the  
Metropolitan  
Planning  
Organization  
for the  
Miami Urbanized  
Area**

***Chairman***  
Ted Silver

***Members***  
Brett Bibeau

Sheila Boyce

Dr. Barry Burak

Amado Leon

Susan Smith

***Contact Information***

David Henderson,  
Bicycle/Pedestrian  
Coordinator  
[davidh@miamidade.gov](mailto:davidh@miamidade.gov)

Miami-Dade MPO  
111 NW First St., #910  
Miami, Florida 33128

305-375-4507  
(fax) 305-375-4950

[www.miamidade.gov/mpo](http://www.miamidade.gov/mpo)



# ***BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE***

SOUTH MIAMI COMMISSION CHAMBERS  
6130 SUNSET DRIVE  
SOUTH MIAMI, FLORIDA

## **A G E N D A**

**MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 2004  
AT 7 P.M.**

- I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
  - MEETING OF JUNE 23, 2004
- III. MEMBER COMMENTS
- IV. PRESENTATIONS
  - A. LIVABLE COMMUNITIES INITIATIVE – J. Seitlin, FDOT
  - B. BAYLINK UPDATE – W. Fernandez, MPO
  - C. 2030 LRP PRELIMINARY CRITERIA REVIEW – D. Henderson
- V. DISCUSSION ITEMS
  - A. BIKE & RIDE – B. Bibeau
  - B. TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM PROJECT PRIORITIZATION – D. Henderson
  - C. GO BOND UPDATE – D. Henderson
- VI. INFORMATION ITEMS
  - A. M-D PUBLIC WORKS PROJECT UPDATES – J. Cohen, MDPW
  - B. APRIL - JUNE PROGRESS REPORT – J. Manzella

# BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 2004

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Brett Bibeau  
Ted Silver

Sheila Boyce  
Amado Leon

Barry Burak  
Susan Smith

### OTHERS PRESENT

David Henderson, Staff  
Don O'Donniley, South Miami Planning

Jae Manzella, Staff

Jeff Cohen, MDP  
Noel Cleland, Cyclist

The meeting began at 7:05 p.m.

<u>ISSUE</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
APPROVAL OF AGENDA	- DH: <i>He would like to present the latest GO Bond findings to the group.</i> TS: <i>He would like to ask the Public Works liaison questions regarding coordination efforts with southern Miami-Dade development.</i> BPAC : <i>Vote – unanimous.</i>
APPROVAL OF MINUTES	- BBibeau: <i>Motion to approve Minutes of May 26, 2004; seconded by SB; vote – unanimous.</i>
MEMBER COMMENTS	- TS: <i>Inquired if this time was set-aside for members to bring-up issues.</i> DH: <i>Yes, aside from issues that are on the current Agenda.</i> TS: <i>Although there aren't any comments from members now, there will be time at the end of the meeting to do so.</i>
2030 LONG-RANGE PLAN NON-MOTORIZED ELEMENT	DH: <i>The Long-Range Plan is updated every 3 years. Since the last update, a Non-Motorized section has been added. This update will focus upon greenways, where the 2025 effort focused upon on-road facilities. An exercise in reprioritizing and including new projects will be done. The list in the Agenda depicts North Dade and South Dade Greenway Plans, as well as other miscellaneous projects, and their funding status. The consultant will review the existing evaluation criteria, and make suggestions to better meet the goals, such as proximity to schools, retail, recreational and work destinations.</i> TS: <i>Inquired if there will be a significant change in the criteria weighting.</i> DH: <i>It will be similar. A new safety rating will be introduced, based upon data collected from crash reports. Also, conditions have changed and new projects will be introduced.</i> TS: <i>Concerned that criteria changes may negate the BPAC's previous efforts.</i> DH: <i>This is an opportunity to refine the process and review newer data, such as population projections.</i> TS: <i>Inquired if there was a reason to make a change in the criteria used.</i> DH: <i>As far as he knows it will be the same criteria, except safety is more defined.</i> TS: <i>The BPAC should review weighting criteria next time, to reaffirm a consensus.</i> DH: <i>This will be done. Some preliminary results should also be ready by then. He wants to be sure that projects that already have partial funding/activity efforts are given sufficient weight to carry them through. A list of 2025 LRP projects is also provided.</i> TS: <i>Both lists should be combined.</i> DH: <i>Stand-alone, on-road bicycle projects are difficult to implement, since the corridors usually require upgrades on drainage and other considerations for major redesign. Similar</i>

	<p>the to the SR 9336 project; if it is improved, it must be brought up to current standards. <i>Thus, for the on-road portion of the 2030 LRP update, he would like to reintroduce the entire 1995 Bicycle Facilities Master Plan network of projects.</i></p> <p>TS: Although there is a general policy for every roadway project, inquired if this strategy would strengthen the requirement to include bicycle considerations.</p> <p>DH: He believes this makes bicycle considerations more relevant. Additionally, when project managers review the LRP, they only see those bike projects that are funded. Including the entire Master Plan network brings a higher awareness and prioritizes bicycle improvements relative to the accompanying roadway projects.</p> <p>NC: Inquired if restriping motor vehicle lanes to a minimum width during repaving projects in order to obtain space for bike lanes or shoulders is a feasible practice.</p> <p>DH: There are few corridors that would accommodate such a change. Tamiami Trl. which has six 12' lanes is one; NE 163 St is another.</p> <p>JM: Engineers are reluctant to reduce current lane widths.</p> <p>DH: The FDOT standard is 12', but allows for 11'. County roads may go down to 10'. This is the strategy for Bayshore Dr. (Commodore Trl.), to free-up space for bike lanes.</p> <p>BBibeau: Inquired as to what the priorities for the LRP mean.</p> <p>DH: The LRP is basically a 20-year plan. Usually, the priorities reflect the construction horizon: #1 is within the 1<sup>st</sup> 5 years, #2 the 2<sup>nd</sup> 5 years, etc.</p> <p>BBibeau: Inquired why the Miami River was in 3 priority listings.</p> <p>DH: The NDGP identifies the entire river for a trail. The LRP doesn't accommodate discrete project sections of the whole trail, thus it was split into those funding sections.</p> <p>SB: Portions of the Miami River are being developed very rapidly within the last 5 years. The priority listings compliment where most development is taking place.</p> <p>TS: That is an example of why the BPAC needs to make another review of projects.</p> <p>SS: The northern section of the county lacks enough projects to accommodate cyclists.</p>
MIAMI-DADE BIKE MAP UPDATE	<p>- DH: Updating the 1<sup>st</sup> Bike Miami Suitability Map has been a long-standing project. Some work has been done; only an interim map is available to the public. This map is too small and overloaded with information. <i>The update will include roadway ratings, as well as popular trails, parks with significant paths and other existing facilities.</i></p> <p>TS: <i>A map should be available on-line to choose a specific area and print that out.</i></p> <p>SB: The MDT website has something like that.</p> <p>TS: For routing purposes, he would not want something that only provides pre-assigned sections of the county. <i>It should be that the user can define an area.</i></p> <p>JM: As it is now, someone can download the map and zoom-in to their desired area.</p> <p>TS: That has an extra step he'd like to avoid.</p> <p>DH: This will not be a route map. Although that can be done as a separate project.</p> <p>TS: An on-line version can provide tools to determine a route. He hopes to avoid a route map that doesn't provide any information if cyclists stray from the primary route.</p> <p>JM: Miami-Dade has started to publish on-line maps. These can be tailored to display only the information users choose. Once the bike map update is finalized, this could be integrated similarly on-line with those capabilities.</p> <p>BBibeau: The Rickenbacker Cswy. seems to be categorized erroneously.</p> <p>DH: It has a path and paved shoulders adjacent to the roadway.</p> <p>TS: A small map showing two adjacent facilities within the entire county has limitations.</p> <p>JM: <i>The updated map would be much larger and the two facilities would be discernable.</i></p> <p>TS: He is apprehensive for a large, unmanageable map only depicting the entire county.</p>

	<p><i>Perhaps the update would have the whole in the front and specific sections on back.</i></p> <p>DH: <i>He presumes these specific sections would be popular cycling destinations, and therefore could also include recommended routes.</i></p> <p>TS: <i>The on-line map should be capable of providing route and destination choices.</i></p> <p>BB: The interim map has areas that could be used for close-ups of certain sections. The Downtown close-up allows the observer to notice the two Rickenbacker facilities. However, the colors are too similar. The roadway should be rated “Better”.</p> <p>JM: The Bike Miami map had the northern section of the county on front and the southern on back; yet, this still wasn’t detailed enough for some people. Putting in close-up sections would require shrinking the whole-county map.</p> <p>TS: <i>Perhaps two maps could be printed one for the north and the other for the south.</i></p> <p>DH: There are several map companies. They divide the county up differently. One had a lot of space in the back that could be used for the close-ups.</p> <p>TS: <i>The whole-county map could be large facilities; close-ups could depict more detail.</i></p> <p>BBibeau: He knows a retired map maker he would like staff to contact.</p>
GOLDEN GLADES MULTIMODAL CENTER WORKSHOP	<p>- DH: This was an chance for BPAC members to voice concerns with mobility problems in the northeast area to various State, regional and local representatives. It is important for pedestrians and cyclists to attend these meetings. If the Chairman didn’t attend the monthly MPO Board meetings, there would be much less b/p issues being discussed. This dialog must be ongoing; when the BPAC met with MIC consultants there were promises for b/p accommodations. After several years have gone by without any contact, there is very little in the plan. <i>A Golden Glades public hearing will be held in September.</i></p> <p>SB: Inquired about using e-mail as an alternative.</p> <p>DH: The project website (which is listed on the newsletter) provides that service.</p> <p>TS: Inquired if the findings presented at the public hearing are finalized.</p> <p>DH: Bicycle/pedestrian issues are more detailed and flexible. There is still opportunity to alter the plan to better accommodate these modes.</p> <p>TS: <i>Requested members to send concerns with this project, so that a list can be made for anyone would can attend the public hearing.</i></p> <p>DH: <i>Requested any comments to the website to be forwarded to him as well.</i></p>
BAYWALK DESIGN WORKSHOP	<p>- BBibeau: This seems like a good project, from respected organizations; and a good opportunity for BPAC input. He is unsure if he will attend the workshop.</p> <p>JC: <i>He hopes to relocate Bike Route 1 (now along Biscayne Blvd.) along the bayside.</i></p>
GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND PROPOSAL	<p>- DH: He hopes more cyclists and pedestrian will attend the continuing public meetings, or participate on-line, to stress the importance of non-motorized transportation projects. This will ultimately sway opinion as to what gets included in the final ordinance. He believes all the projects will be listed, as they were for the People’s Transportation Plan. MDP&amp;R is hoping greenways are priorities for these funds. <i>Final recommendations would be submitted to the BCC in July.</i> More information is available at the website.</p> <p>BBibeau: <i>He preferred that the multiple questions would be separated out.</i></p>
BPAC INFORMATION ON WWW	<p>- DH: <i>The BPAC’s section of the MPO website is being revamped.</i> It was requested that members’ contact information is posted. Inquired if members have any concerns with this. Otherwise he can continue to have his e-mail address listed and forward any messages.</p> <p>AL: Didn’t have a problem posting his e-mail address.</p> <p>SB: Didn’t have a problem posting her e-mail address.</p> <p>BBibeau: Apprehensive with this. Also, the mention of “bike land” should be “bike</p>

		lane”. The calendar doesn’t highlight meeting dates.
MPO GOVERNING BOARD AND TPC AGENDAS	-	<p>TS: He will be attending the MPO Board meetings, but wanted information on the TPC.</p> <p>DH: <i>Every BPAC members will receive both MPO &amp; TPC meeting notices.</i></p> <p>BBibeau: Inquired about the S River Dr Corridor Study.</p> <p>DH: That is a City of Medley project.</p>
RICKEN- BACKER UPDATE	-	<p>JC: <i>Requested that this reoccurring section of the BPAC Agendas be renamed “Public Works Project Updates”.</i> Since the 3 years that the Rickenbacker designs were developed, standards for design have changed. <i>Next week, he will be meeting with his fellow engineers to update the plans to represent those changes.</i></p> <p>BBibeau: Inquired if the changes will be significant.</p> <p>JC: Pedestrian crosswalks and bike lanes next to turn bays are slightly affected.</p> <p>TS: Inquired if this would delay the project significantly.</p> <p>JC: This is a necessary delay, then the process will continue as planned. There may be a cost savings. The project has not gone out to bid yet.</p> <p>BBibeau: <i>Requests a project timeline; including the expected RFP ad; when final bids will be received; how long the review process will take; when the notice to proceed will be made; and, when the project is expected to be finalized.</i> It has been 3 years so far.</p>
GO BOND PROPOSALS	-	<p>DH: The handout map depicts those projects relating to the GO Bond proposal which call for in bicycle facilities. The GO Bond is an extension of the 1974 Bond passed by voters. If the GO Bond does not pass, real estate taxes will be reduced. <i>If it passes, there would be no increase; but a wide variety of new projects, (e.g., parks, police, sewers, port tunnel), would be funded through the \$2.6 billion revenue.</i></p> <p>BBibeau: He read in the <u>Miami Herald</u> there was \$88 million allocated for bike projects.</p> <p>DH: Could not verify that amount. He developed a short list upon request on a Friday afternoon for a Monday morning deadline. Afterwards, the Parks and Planning Depts. added projects. They add up to \$24 million; including: \$7.5 million for the Miami River Greenway; \$1 million for the Commodore Trl.; Old Cutler Rd. bridge over the C-100.</p> <p>TS: Inquired about the items listed in some regional parks as “vehicular and pedestrian circulation”. These are not on the short list. Inquired if they omit bicycle facilities.</p> <p>DH: Probably not. In reality the short list should be longer, because <i>the Parks Dept. will be doing bicycle improvements within their parks.</i> The short list represents linear transportation/mobility. He can invite Parks representatives to discuss this with the group.</p> <p>TS: <i>Prefers to have DH research this first.</i> If they are including bikes in these projects it would be an advantage to include that wording in the description. <i>If they are excluding bicycle accommodations, he would like to know how Parks staff came up with these projects for pedestrians without bicycle accommodations.</i></p> <p>BBibeau: <i>On June 24<sup>th</sup> at 4pm, there will be a BCC meeting to discuss these proposals.</i></p> <p>DH: He tried to give a balance in his list submission to the north and south regions. The Parks Dept. included the NDGP and SDGN mentions as a general description in order to implement smaller projects within the two networks not yet specified.</p>
MISCEL- LANEOUS	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JC: He met with a traffic Engineer and reviewed the intersection of S Miami Av. and SW 32 Rd. This leads to Wainwright Pk. and Bike Route 1 easterly, as well as westerly to the Vizcaya overpass and M-Path. <i>A sequence of signage will be installed to direct cyclists to these destinations. The M-Path will be redesignated as Bike Route M. Along this route, the traffic signal actuator loops embedded in the roadway will be adjusted to sense bicycle frames and signage will be installed to</i></li> </ul>

*inform cyclists of this opportunity. This will be a demonstration project for the actuators.*

- JC: The Venetian Cswy. is the best route for cyclists to/from the beach. *The contract to re-stripe the lanes was stopped in order to upgrade the shoulders to bike lanes. Signage will also be added. The roadway islands are a concern; the bike lanes will probably be aligned/adjacent to the frontage roads.*

DH: Cyclists don't normally use those roads; they stay on the main road.

JC: Routing bike lanes along the main road becomes an engineering problem at those intersections. *This will be re-designated as Bike Route V.*

AL: Inquired if there was a timeframe for the project.

JC: It already started before he noticed it. *Some new striping will be repainted.*

BBibeau: Inquired why such a project isn't flagged for bike lanes already.

JC: Restriping contracts are structured as "blanket orders" for roads countywide, not specifically for one road. The striping is done just as it was previously laid down.

BBibeau: That process is flawed. *There should be a review to check if bicycle accommodations can be made.*

JC: Reviewing roads scheduled for restriping would delay the process tremendously.

TS: This is an opportunity to retrofit some roads, yet it isn't being advantage of. *This should be a standard operating procedure.*

JC: The majority of roads being re-stripped would not be a simple retrofit for bikes.

BBibeau: It was for this corridor.

JC: Most County roads don't have uniform shoulders; that's why Venetian Cswy. can be retrofitted with bike lanes. There is a review process; but this project slipped by. The contractor was given the go-ahead before he had a chance to review it.

TS: *All projects should have a checklist for review before they are issued to proceed.*

JC: He is being diligent in getting the rest of PW staff to be aware of the need to review projects for b/p considerations. However, the possibility of retrofitting a corridor for bicycling is so rare, it would be a large effort with few results.

BBurak: If these road specifications are in a computer, it should be able to identify candidates with the characteristics to possibly accommodate a retrofit.

JC: The striping contractor gets a simple list of candidate roadways. Then they field-review them to determine which are faded enough to restripe. The FDOT has more opportunity to retrofit for bike lanes, because many of their roads have shoulders.

TS: Inquired about the review process and how b/p considerations are targeted.

JC: Every design project is reviewed by him as the Bicycle/Pedestrian Engineer.

TS: Concerned with the impact of developments in southern Miami-Dade.

JC: He reviews these roadways and checks for SDGN compliance. Developers are notified of the plan's objective; however, because canals are owned by SFWMD, the Public Works Dept. cannot force them to adhere to the Plan. When roadways are concerned, PW does have authority to require bicycle facilities.

BBibeau: Reiterated TS's desire for a checklist for b/p considerations in projects.

JC: Reiterated that every project has to be reviewed by him. He performs that duty.

SB: The BPAC is presented many projects where the consultant seems to know very little about b/p considerations and the designs lack any. Often, these projects are nearing the final phase and it's usually too late to change them.

JC: Those projects originate from other agencies.

DD: It is a historical oversight throughout the state that land-use planning is not in

coordination with transportation planning. It is only recently that multi-modal planning is incorporating these considerations. Each municipality is supposed to have policies in place to consider all modes. Some are mandating b/p considerations, but most Comprehensive Plan budgets are micromanaged by politicians after the planners draft them. This is the single-most reason Comprehensive Plans are not in conformance with their priorities.

JC: This structure does exist in Miami-Dade County. The problem is that it only requires consideration for b/p accommodations; it is not a mandate. To accommodate bicyclists in every nearly new project would require more right-of-way than is existing. The PW Dept. tries to minimize purchasing more ROW, in order to maximize the amount of motor vehicle projects it can implement. *His Directors will be issuing notice to the Planning Dept. to require an increase in zoned ROW for roads to accommodate bicycle facilities in their construction. This would be done on a case-by-case basis.* If a corridor only has a few tracks that could be acquired at a wider ROW, this won't be done; but, *when whole miles can be obtained, it would be.*

DD: Both small and large municipalities mandate b/p considerations with great success. They value the mobility of these modes over the costs of extra ROW.

TS: The process for any agencies to consider b/p mobility in this county is flawed. Reviewing these projects for bicycle considerations shouldn't be too much of a burden; identifying a few projects out of many that could provide a facility can be a boon for cyclists. *This should be considered at the beginning of the process.*

JC: *He will e-mail the restriping engineer reminding him to consider bicycle mobility.*

TS: Concerned that would be just one instance and easily forgotten.

BBibeau: *Motion requesting each agency responsible for surface transportation to present to the BPAC, (within 3-4 months), the written procedures they follow that relate to b/p accommodations, and to incorporate the Miami-Dade policy considering each project for b/p mobility.* This is a major problem in our region; we're looking for solutions to make the process better.

TS: Perhaps the presentation and review of their policy is the first step, rather than requiring them to do something.

BBibeau: Agrees. *These written policies should be forwarded to the BPAC far in advance of any meeting with agency representatives.*

TS: To reiterate: *those agencies (determined by staff) that are involved with any modification to surface transportation facilities, or the State & County policies involving bicycle facilities, to make a presentation to the BPAC; as well as provide the general, written guidelines regarding their procedures to implement such facilities; seconded by AL.* This is not a request for what specific determinations they make after the decision is made to include a bicycle facility.

BPAC: *Vote – unanimous.*

BBurak: This is one of the most important matters the BPAC has done. *These meetings should be publicized to show that we are trying to reduce all the tragic occurrences that have made our county one of the worst areas in the nation to bike.*

- JC: *Developers of Beacon Lakes, (which is between NW 137 Av./HEFT and SR 836/NW 12 St.), will be constructing a zig-zag of bike lanes along some of the roads. This is near the proximity of the proposed Beacon Trl. Miami-Dade will continue the route along SW 137 Av to SW 8 St with wide curb-lanes.*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• JC: Finds the wording for delay of bicycle facility development the April-June progress report offensive. Most of the North and South Dade Greenway Plans have been adopted by the Park &amp; Recreation Dept., since many routes are off-road.</li> <li>• JC: <i>Some new bikeway signage will include “Wrong Way” notices for bike lanes.</i> This has been a prevalent problem along Crandon Blvd.</li> </ul>
--	---

- *The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.*